

Supreme Court, U. S.

FILED

JUN 14 1978

MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

**Supreme Court of the United States**

**October Term 1977**

**No. 77-1770**

**WILLIAM HOCKRIDGE,**

*Petitioner,*

**v.**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,**

*Respondent.*

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF  
APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT**

**IRVING ANOLIK**

*Attorney for Petitioner*

225 Broadway

New York, N. Y. 10007

212-732-3050



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Statement .....	1
Opinions Below .....	2
Questions Presented .....	2
Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved ..	4
Statement of the Case .....	5
Evidence of Jury Misconduct .....	6
The Factual Background with Respect to Hockridge	13
I—Reasons for Granting the Writ .....	17
II—Opinions Expressed By The Second Circuit In The Instant Case Conflict With The Opinions Of Other Circuits In Vital Areas Concerning The Administration Of Criminal Justice .....	25
III—Hockridge and Easton Were Denied the Right to A Proper Poll of the Jury .....	30
CONCLUSION .....	32

### Cases Cited

Allen v. U.S. ....	28
Andres v. U.S. ....	24
Apodaca v. Oregon .....	17, 24
Beaty v. U.S. ....	27
Bruce v. Chestnut Farms-Chevy Chaise Dairy .....	24
Cherensky v. George Washington-East Motor Lodge	21
Clark v. U.S. ....	19, 21

**Cases Cited (Continued)**

	PAGE
Cook v. U.S. ....	24
Fox v. U.S. ....	21, 24
Government of Virgin Islands v. Gereau ....	18
Grace Lines, Inc. v. Motley ....	22
Irvin v. Dowd ....	19
Jorgensen v. York Ice Machinery Corporation ....	22
Kingsport Utilities, Inc. v. Lamson ....	24
McDonald v. Pless ....	18
Miranda v. U.S. ....	30
Mullin v. U.S. ....	28
Pinkerton v. U.S. ....	30
U.S. v. Bailey ....	29
U.S. v. Breland ....	22
U.S. v. Brown ....	32
U.S. v. Chereton ....	20
U.S. v. Fioravanti ....	32
U.S. v. Fox ....	24
U.S. v. Green ....	29
U.S. v. Grieco ....	24
U.S. v. Gullia ....	26
U.S. v. Kenner ....	29
U.S. v. Mathis ....	31
U.S. v. Pleva ....	23



### Cases Cited (Continued)

	PAGE
U.S. v. Rabb .....	27
U.S. v. Reid .....	19
U.S. v. Robinson .....	28
U.S. v. Schroeder .....	21
U.S. v. Sexton .....	24
U.S. v. Thomas .....	32
Vaise v. Delaval .....	18
Vizzini v. Ford Motor Company .....	19
Williams v. U.S. ....	24, 31

### Statutes and Rules Cited

American Bar Association, "Standards Relating to: Trial by Jury" .....	18, 21
8 Wigmore, "Evidence" (McNaughton ed. 1961) .....	18, 21, 22
F.R.E. Rule 606(b) .....	19, 22
F.R.Cr.P. Rule 31(b) .....	19
F.R.Cr.P. Rule 31(d) .....	30
6A Moore's "Federal Practice" (2d ed. 1974) .....	21
3 Weinstein's "Evidence" .....	21
8A Moore's "Federal Practice" (1977 Revision) ..	22



IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**  
**October Term 1977**

No.

---

WILLIAM HOCKRIDGE,

*Petitioner,*

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Respondent.*

---

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF  
APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT**

---

**Statement**

Petitioner WILLIAM HOCKRIDGE, respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the order and judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit entered the 27th day of March, 1978, affirming the judgment of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York which had convicted the petitioner and two others, namely Charles Petri and Stephen Easton, of conspiracy to violate 18 U.S.C. § 656 (embezzling, abstracting, purloining and misapplying monies and assets of a federal insured bank) and of one substantive count of such violation, after trial before Bonsal, D.J.

The United States Court of Appeals entertained an application for rehearing, but denied that relief on the 15th day of May, 1978. (A-22)

We adopt the brief and petition submitted by the co-defendant-appellant in the case, Stephen K. Easton, which has previously been docketed in this Court under No. 77-1243.

### **Opinions Below**

The opinion of the Court of Appeals, not yet reported, appears in the Appendix hereto at pages A-1 to A-17. No opinion was rendered by the District Court for the Southern District of New York determining petitioner's motion to set aside the verdict. The District Court did render an opinion respecting the similar motion of two co-defendants, which opinion appears in the Appendix hereto at pages A-19 to A-21.

### **Questions Presented**

1. May a partial jury verdict stand where two jurors, during jury deliberations but after the partial verdict has been rendered, advise the Court that the verdict was not unanimous, that they surrendered their honest conviction of petitioner's innocence, and that they were coerced because "incredibly attacked personally"? This question presents novel, unresolved and important issues concerning the interpretation and administration of Rule 606(b) of the Federal Rules of Evidence and Rule 31(b) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

2. Where during a private interview with and instruction of two jurors during deliberations the Court directed

the jurors to raise their questions anew with the jury for redeliberation and stated that the Court would question the jurors again, did the Court coerce the rendering of a verdict on Count Two and err in rendering a private instruction, by failing to instruct the entire jury to deliberate anew, failing to call for the jury's verdict again and failing to repoll the jury?

3. Where the redacted indictment charged four defendants with twenty-four crimes, the trial endured over thirty days, sixty-nine witnesses were heard and fragmented verdicts taken, was petitioner's right to poll the jury denied when the jury was polled on Count One as to all defendants collectively rather than as to each individually?

4. Whether the Court erred in refusing to dismiss the indictment as against Hockridge, pursuant to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, at the conclusion of the Government's case in chief when it appeared obvious that there was insufficient evidence to warrant submitting the case to the jury?

5. Whether Petitioner was denied due process of law by the Government's withholding of evidence that there was a major investigation of Chemical Bank (HOCKRIDGE's former employer), which resulted in several indictments of the bank and its officers?

6. Whether the Court erred in failing to grant a mistrial early in the case when information concerning prejudice on the part of certain jurors came to its attention?

### **Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved**

United States Constitution Fifth Amendment:

“No person shall . . . be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law . . . .”

United States Code, Title 28:

Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 606(b):

*“Inquiry into validity of verdict or indictment. Upon an inquiry into the validity of a verdict or indictment, a juror may not testify as to any matter or statement occurring during the course of the jury’s deliberations or to the effect of anything upon his or any other juror’s mind or emotions as influencing him to assent to or dissent from the verdict or indictment or concerning his mental processes in connection therewith, except that a juror may testify on the question whether extraneous prejudicial information was improperly brought to the jury’s attention or whether any outside influence was brought to bear upon any juror. Nor may his affidavit or evidence of any statement by him concerning a matter about which he would be precluded from testifying be received for these purposes.”*

United States Code, Title 18:

Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rule 31(b):

“Several Defendants. If there are two or more defendants, the jury at any time during its deliberations may return a verdict or verdicts with respect to a defendant or defendants as to whom it has agreed; if the jury cannot agree with respect to all, the defendant or defendants as to whom it does not agree may be tried again.”

Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rule 31(d):

“Poll of Jury. When a verdict is returned and before it is recorded the jury shall be polled at the request of any party or upon the court’s own motion. If upon the poll there is not unanimous concurrence, the jury may be directed to return for further deliberations or may be discharged.”

### Statement of the Case

Petitioner seeks review of an order and judgment of the United States Court of Appeals which affirmed the judgment of the District Court, as set forth *supra*.

The Petitioner herein was sentenced to 9 months incarceration on the conspiracy charge and to 3 years imprisonment on the substantive count upon which he was convicted [Count Two]. The execution thereof was stayed, however, with directions that he be placed on probation for 3 years at the expiration of his confinement on the first count.

Petitioner Hockridge was also indicted on a number of other counts alleging false statements on applications for bank loans (18 U.S.C. 1014) and false entries in the books of the bank (18 U.S.C. 1005). Hockridge, however was acquitted of all these other counts.

The first count charged conspiracy to violate 18 U.S.C. §§ 656, 1005 and 1014 (1970). The second count charged that Hockridge, an assistant vice-president and loan officer of the Chemical Bank, misapplied funds of that bank obtained by unsecured loans and that Petri, Flynn, Whitney and Easton, alleged principals of the corporate borrowers, aided and abetted such misconduct (18 U.S.C. §§ 656 and 2 (1970)). Counts Three through Seventeen charged the de-

fendants with making false financial statements with respect to the various alleged shell corporations for the purpose of influencing the Chemical Bank and Bank of New York to make certain loans (18 U.S.C. § 1014 (1970)). Counts Eighteen through Twenty-Four charged that Hockridge, aided and abetted by the remaining defendants except Rapport, made false entries in the books of the Chemical Bank (18 U.S.C. § 1005 (1970)).

All defendants but Whitney entered pleas of not guilty.

The trial of this complex multi-defendant matter before a jury commenced on December 2, 1976, with the Honorable Dudley B. Bonsal presiding, and continued until 34 days thereafter when the jury was discharged, after rendering verdicts on thirteen counts. Forty-three government and twenty-six defense witnesses were heard.

The jury found Hockridge and Easton guilty on Counts One and Two (hereinafter also the "conspiracy" and "misapplication" counts). Easton was found not guilty on all counts relating to the making of false financial statements. Petri was found guilty on Counts One, Two and Eight. Flynn was acquitted on all counts.

### **Evidence of Jury Misconduct**

On the morning of the fifth day of the trial, the Court received a note from Juror Number Three. The Judge interviewed the juror in chambers and she revealed that the jury had been improperly discussing the case during recesses and that:

"[T]he people in the jury are not giving these people [defendants] a fair chance . . . several of the peo-



ple have expressed their opinion that these people are guilty.” (T. 566).<sup>2</sup>

The Court dismissed the juror’s comments stating:

“I don’t think it is serious and I think this is the normal reaction of a young perhaps little idealistic girl . . . .” (T. 570).

Defendants moved for a mistrial on the ground of jury bias. The motion was denied (T. 570). The Court later determined to interview the other jurors (T. 627). The interviews were brief. The Judge prefaced his inquiry by reminding each juror of the obligation not to discuss the case, an admonition clearly tending to discourage revelation of misconduct (T. 688-727).

During the interviews seven other jurors and two alternates indicated they had heard jurors express opinions as to defendants’ guilt (*see, e.g.*, T. 696). The motion for a mistrial was renewed (T. 730-1) and denied (T. 736).

Substantial misconduct also occurred during the jury deliberations. Throughout the morning of Friday, February 11, 1977, the Court charged the jury. At 4:45 p.m. the jury asked to hear the charge concerning the elements of a conspiracy again (T. 5864), and the charge was repeated.<sup>3</sup> The jury concluded deliberations at 9:30 p.m. (T. 5877). They had not reached any verdict.

Deliberations resumed Monday, February 14, 1977. The jury requested further exhibits (T. 5880) and was read

---

<sup>2</sup> Parenthetical references in the form “(T.       )” are to the pages of the transcript below.

<sup>3</sup> Prior thereto, the jurors had requested that certain exhibits be transmitted to them (T. 5862, 5863), including evidence admitted subject to connection (*e.g.*, T. 5863, 5880, 5901, 5908-9).

portions of Easton's testimony and testimony of a bank officer concerning conversations had with Easton relating to one loan (T. 5882-3). At 6:30 p.m. the jury upon inquiry by the Court reported that it had reached a verdict as to three defendants on Count One of the indictment. Over objection, the Court heard the partial verdict finding Hockridge, Petri and Easton guilty (T. 5961-2). At defendants' request the jury was polled; *however, each juror was not polled separately as to each defendant.*

The following day, the jury heard further excerpts from the testimony and received further exhibits (T. 5907-9). No further verdicts were rendered. At 5:00 p.m. the Judge revealed for the first time that *that morning* he had received a note from Juror Number Four requesting to see him; the Judge determined not to interview the juror (T. 5909-15).<sup>4</sup> The jury was discharged for the day.

The next day, February 16, 1977, at 10:00 a.m. the Court revealed to counsel his receipt of a note from Juror Number Three (T. 5920-8). The note read:

"Judge Bonsal, please see me as soon as possible this morning. *I feel that I have committed a grave injustice. Inasmuch as I let myself be led or rushed for lack of a better word into agreeing with the verdict of the jury.*" (T. 5920) (emphasis added).<sup>5</sup>

The Court determined to interview Jurors Number Three and Four, rather than immediately setting aside the partial verdict, to "see [if he could find] any way of salvaging this

---

<sup>4</sup> The Second Circuit opinion recites that the note was received at 5 p.m. (A-8). The record indicates the note was received earlier, but the receipt only revealed by the Court at 5 p.m.

<sup>5</sup> The jury was separated during the deliberations. On the morning of February 16, 1977 the New York Daily News reported the partial verdict, identifying the United States Attorney's Office as its source (T. 5924).

thing” (T. 5921).<sup>6</sup> Concerning the interview, the Court stated:

“I am not going to let it [the Count One verdict] stand if I am satisfied that this lady as she says it was pressured into doing it.” (T. 5923).

The Court interviewed the two jurors in chambers. Counsel were not present. The jurors indicated that their comments were directed to the partial conspiracy verdict (T. 5928).

At first, Juror Number Three indicated that her comments were with respect to all three defendants (T. 5928). She indicated she felt the evidence insufficient as to Hockridge and Petri (T. 5928-9). As she began to speak about Easton, the Court interrupted and turned his inquiry to Juror Number Four. She indicated that during the deliberations she “was personally attacked incredibly by two members [of the jury]” (T. 5929). The Court refused to permit her to describe the nature of the attack (T. 5930).

Juror Number Four indicated that ultimately she became secure in the guilty verdict respecting Hockridge and Petri (T. 5930). However, as to Easton, she indicated that she, and several others jurors, were:

“[R]ailroaded, you know, before we could bring up our doubts . . . I know that at the time when we were polled that I should have said no.” (T. 5930-1).<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Later he stated: “I hope that in some way that [the interview] might salvage the situation” (T. 5923). However well-intended, the Trial Judge’s view that harassment of a juror, precluding him and her from rendering an independent and honest verdict, could be cured or “salvaged” by a subsequent private judicial interview can hardly be justified.

<sup>7</sup> In fact, she had no opportunity to do so, since the poll was not conducted individually as to each defendant (T. 5945).

The Court then turned to Juror Number Three and stated to her:

“[Y]ou have had sort of an emotional problem with this thing here, haven’t you?”

“JUROR No. 3: It can be an emotional problem but the question in my mind is the reasonable doubt . . . [instruction as to reasonable doubt omitted].

“THE COURT: I think what I would like to do is this. You know, I mentioned to you when I charged you I don’t want you ever to surrender your honest convictions because of other jurors.

“JUROR No. 3: That is what I did.

“THE COURT: You *think* you did.” (T. 5931) (emphasis added).

The Court’s comments plainly deprecated the jurors’ concern about the want of unanimity. Rather than confronting the strong-arm tactics of some of the jurors, the Court left the situation unresolved, apparently in the interest of salvaging the verdict in this lengthy trial. The Judge instructed the two jurors:

“I would like you to think about that [the conspiracy verdict] and resume your deliberations and then we’ll see how it goes today with the deliberations and then perhaps after we finish here I will want to see you again.

“JUROR No. 3: *I don’t understand what you mean. Continue the deliberating—*

“THE COURT: After the jury finishes, I think I will want to see you again and talk again about some of these things that you have told me this morning.

But I think it would be wise if both of you could go back with the jurors.

"You have got a problem and you do the same thing with respect to Mr. Easton. Think that one over pretty carefully . . . .

\* \* \*

"JUROR No. 4: I know there is one other member too who feels that way too.

"THE COURT: About what?

"JUROR No. 4: I think about all three actually. But I think specifically about Easton also.

"THE COURT: All right. Why don't you go back then and let's see where we go today and I'll follow this up.

\* \* \*

"One other thought. When you go back with the jury and when you think it is an appropriate time, you raise your points again with the jury about what you think about what they have done and see what they think about that and have an exchange on that."  
(T. 5932-4) (emphasis added)

The two jurors were sent to resume deliberations.

Defendants moved for a mistrial (T. 5935). Easton's motion was never formally decided.

At no time following the private instruction did the Judge charge the jury as a whole to deliberate anew as to Easton, as he had charged the two jurors. The jury was never advised of the substance of the Court's private interview.

At 2:30 p.m. of the day of the interview, the jury found Flynn not guilty on Count One (T. 5955). Further requests for evidence and testimony relating to Easton were made.

The following day at 2:00 p.m., after spending much of the morning hearing testimony read, the jury returned a further partial verdict, finding Hockridge, Petri and Easton guilty on Count Two, Flynn not guilty on Count Two, and all defendants not guilty on substantive Counts Three and Four (T. 5968-70).

Thereafter, the jury rendered verdicts on Counts Eight, Ten, Eleven, Twelve, Thirteen, Fourteen, Twenty and Twenty-one; Easton was found not guilty on all counts.

A verdict finding all defendants not guilty on Count Seventeen was thereafter rendered (T. 6021).

After six days of deliberation the jury was discharged (T. 6022-3) and the Court thereafter dismissed the remaining counts.

The Judge never met with Jurors Number Three and Four again. The jury was never instructed to redeliberate as to Easton. The Judge did not repoll the jury as to Count One. The Judge did not permit Jurors Number Three and Four to alter their verdict as to Easton.

Easton was sentenced on June 15, 1977. Apparently, the Court had determined to deny his motion for a mistrial and to set aside the verdict, although no formal decision was rendered.<sup>8</sup>

Petitioner Hockridge, at the time of the incidents, as set forth in the indictment, was a man in his late twenties, never previously in conflict with the law, and was employed by Chemical Bank in a career position. He was a

---

<sup>8</sup> A formal decision was rendered with respect to a similar motion by Hockridge and Petri. The Court wrote that it was "satisfied that neither of the two jurors surrendered their honest convictions" (A-19).



loan officer. As a result of this case, he was summarily fired, but has consistently maintained his innocence and took the stand in his own defense.

The evidence against him was, for the most part, hearsay and circumstantial. As we explain, *infra*, the accusations of criminality contained in the indictment were conclusively refuted by documentary evidence and by direct testimony. The trial Court should not have permitted this case to go to the jury with respect to Hockridge.

### **The Factual Background with Respect to Hockridge**

The main thrust of the evidence against Hockridge was his alleged misapplication of funds from Chemical Bank, by whom he was employed as a loan officer. More particularly, the evidence against defendant revolved around a \$14,000 check, about which the Government centered its case against Hockridge, alleging, in substance, that this was obviously a kickback to Hockridge for having approved a certain loan.

In truth and in fact, as the evidence revealed, the \$14,000 was a check given to Hockridge by Nancy Petri so he could purchase 1,000 shares of Frigitemp stock. The proof at trial revealed that this sum was paid back in full together with \$414 in interest. There was absolutely no evidence, therefore, that Hockridge received this money as a gift or gratuity or kickback, or for any improper purpose.

The Government also sought to link Hockridge with the signature on two cards at the Regency Hotel located on Madison Avenue in New York City. Perhaps this was to suggest possible amorous escapades on the part of the Petitioner. The proof, however, adduced at trial, estab-

lished that the signatures on those cards were not in Hockridge's handwriting, so that, too, was just a "red herring" dragged across the case to confuse and bemuse the jury.

Mr. Otis of the Bank of New York made a \$150,000 loan, predicted much upon the same basis as utilized by Hockridge when he approved loans to certain firms.

Otis admitted that not infrequently errors are made on the so-called "white" sheets, and further declared that he himself had made a number of mistakes in connection with loans. Otis, of course, was never charged nor indicted.

Mr. Whitney of the Petri organization admitted that he had lunch or dinner with Hockridge on perhaps forty or fifty occasions, but that he had never discussed business. Whitney had admitted lying in the grand jury and also was mistaken about supposedly giving Hockridge \$980 in cash, but later admitted that he was mistaken about this.

Mr. Fillet had said that he spoke to Mr. Petri concerning defendant Hockridge within two weeks after he started working for Petri in July. Since defendant had never met Petri until September, it was obvious that Fillet was lying.

The Government sought to make much of the fact that Hockridge had acquired stock of CSPI Corporation, but it was established at trial that this stock was acquired in 1969, long before Hockridge ever met Petri. Thus, this, too, was irrelevant.

It was obvious that there were a number of conspiracies which were presented to the jurors (3369).\*

---

\* Numerals in parentheses refer to pages of the official court reporter's minutes of trial, unless otherwise indicated.



Hockridge was a loan officer employed by Chemical Bank and the prosecutor sought to establish that he had received \$14,000 as a result of a loan made to Today Stores, Inc. In addition, he supposedly received a fur coat for his wife and a pool table and a trip, for other services.

The proof adduced by Hockridge and by exhibits introduced into evidence established that \$14,000 was a loan obtained by Hockridge from Petri's wife for investment in 1,000 shares of Frigitemp stock and that this amount was fully repaid to Petri's wife, with interest.

Also, there was proof introduced that Hockridge had made some trips with his family, but he paid \$980 to cover these expenses.

We need not dwell on the extensive discussion in the case concerning any charges above Counts One and Two since defendant was acquitted of all those other counts or there were dismissals following the jury's inability to reach verdicts on some of them.

For the purpose of this record, the Court dismissed Counts Five, Six, Seven, Fifteen, Sixteen, Eighteen, Nineteen, Twenty-One, Twenty-Three, and Twenty-Four, with the consent of the Government, on February 23, 1977.

We are adopting the arguments and recitation of facts of the co-petitioner, Stephen Easton.

The thrust of the Government's case, therefore, was that Hockridge had embezzled a sum of money, namely \$14,000, by virtue of a kickback which he allegedly received in connection with a loan to Today Stores, Inc.\*

---

\* This was completely refuted, but in any event, it could not have been an embezzlement from the Bank.

We have already indicated that there was a complete refutation of this allegation by concrete proof that the \$14,000 was in fact repaid by Hockridge and had been advanced to him solely to enable him to buy 1,000 shares of Frigitemp stock. In fact, the loan was repaid with interest.

The Government conceded that its case was predicated primarily on circumstantial evidence (3385).

In fact, the testimony against Hockridge was virtually all hearsay and defense counsel at trial argued, in vain, that the Court should not have submitted the case to the jury (3406, 3407).

We are not dealing with the elaborate testimony that came into the case concerning Hockridge's preparation of so-called "white" sheets, or testimony that came in against various defendants with respect to the other counts of the indictment on which Hockridge was not convicted.

The Government took the position that Hockridge was instrumental in the approval of a number of loans based upon false financial statements and other false material and that Hockridge was fully aware of the falsity of these predicate materials upon which the loans were approved.

It boiled down, however, to the one \$14,000 transaction in connection with Today Stores, Inc. loan which Hockridge established was in fact a loan to him which was fully repaid with interest.

## Reasons for Granting the Writ

### I.

#### **Novel Issues Concerning the Interpretation and Administration of Rule 606(b) of the Federal Rules of Evidence and Rule 31(b) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure are Presented By the Pre-Discharge Court-Juror Interview Revealing Misconduct and Lack of Unanimity.**

The Second Circuit ruled that the principal issue presented to it was a novel question concerning the interpretation and interplay of Rule 606(b) of the Federal Rules of Evidence (hereinafter "F.R.E.") and Rule 31(b) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (hereinafter "F.R.Cr.P.") which "[n]either the cases nor the treatises definitively answer. . . ." That issue is whether F.R.E. Rule 606(b) renders incompetent the voluntary statements of jurors made to the Court after a partial verdict is rendered but while deliberations are continuing, which statements evidence jury misconduct and lack of unanimity<sup>11</sup> regarding the partial verdict. Petitioner believes the issue to be one of substantial importance in the administration of justice by the federal courts, by reason of the frequency with which judges at trial permit partial verdicts to be taken.

The District Court at bar, ruling upon Hockridge's and Petri's motions to set aside, did not address the question squarely, finding that the jurors had not surrendered their

---

<sup>11</sup> Unanimity is, of course, a non-waivable constitutional mandate, under the Sixth Amendment and under F.R.Cr.P. Rule 31(a). See *Apodaca v. Oregon*, 406 U.S. 404 (1972). However, the clear effect of the Second Circuit's decision in the instant case is to impose a constitutionally improper waiver of the unanimity rule, during the course of jury deliberations.

honest convictions. Juror Number Three, however, *expressly* stated that this was the case (T. 5931). The Court of Appeals held F.R.E. Rule 606(b) applicable to partial verdicts and notwithstanding the jurors' statement of coercion and lack of unanimity permitted the conviction to stand.

#### **A. The Evidence Was Competent**

F.R.E. Rule 606(b), set forth *supra*, pp. 3-4, renders certain evidence incompetent to impeach a jury verdict.

While recent cases and legislative history indicate that Rule 606(b) is intended (a) to protect jurors from post-discharge harassment, minimize the risk of jury tampering, and secure the privacy of deliberations, and (b) to promote the finality of verdicts, *e.g.*, *Government of Virgin Islands v. Gereau*, 523 F.2d 140, 148-50 (3d Cir. 1975), *cert. denied*, 424 U.S. 917 (1976), American Bar Association, *Standards Relating To: Trial by Jury* (Approved Draft 1968), Commentary to § 5.7(a) (hereinafter "ABA, *Standards Relating to Trial by Jury*"), only the former reasons are cited in the seminal decisions of this Court.<sup>12</sup>

For example, in *McDonald v. Pless*, 238 U.S. 264 (1915), articulating the rule in a civil action, the Court wrote that absent such a rule:

"Jurors would be harassed and beset by the defeated party in an effort to secure from them evidence of facts which might establish misconduct. . . . [T]he result would be to make what was intended to be a

---

<sup>12</sup> The rule was initially premised upon the maxim that no person shall be allowed to allege his own turpitude. *Vaise v. Delaval*, 1 Term Rep. 11, 99 Eng. Rep. 944 (K.B. 1785). However, that doctrinal basis has since been discarded. 8 Wigmore, *Evidence* § 2352 (McNaughton ed. 1961); ABA, *Standards Relating to Trial by Jury*, at 168.

private deliberation, the constant subject of public investigation . . . ." *Id.* at 267-8.<sup>13</sup>

Only one reported decision, apart from the instant matter, has been found addressing the issue of whether F.R.E. Rule 606(b) applies to impeachment prior to jury discharge but after a partial verdict has been rendered under F.R.Cr.P. Rule 31(b). The legislative history and language of the Rule are silent.

In the reported decision on point, the Third Circuit declined to decide the issue. This was *Vizzini v. Ford Motor Company*, 72 F.R.D. 132 (E.D. Pa. 1976), *vacated and remanded on other grounds*, 569 F.2d 754 (3d Cir. 1977). In a bifurcated civil trial, the District Court had declared a mistrial as to damages but held F.R.E. Rule 606(b) a bar to reception of evidence to impeach the liability verdict. The evidence, unearthed during deliberations as to damages, indicated that the previously rendered verdict as to liability was the result of compromise. 72 F.R.D. at 136. On appeal, the Third Circuit vacated and remanded, ruling that the issues of liability and damages were so intertwined as to require a new trial on both questions. The Court specifically declined to determine whether Rule 606(b) was applicable under the circumstances. 569 F.2d at 762, n.2.

In the case at bar, evidence was placed before the Court on the fifth day of trial that numerous jurors entertained pre-conceived notions of the defendants' guilt. This, in itself, constituted grounds for declaration of a mistrial. *Cf., Clark v. United States*, 289 U.S. 1 (1933); *Irvin v. Dowd*, 366 U.S. 717 (1961).

---

<sup>13</sup> This Court has always stated that no inflexible rule can be laid down because: "[C]ases might arise in which it would be impossible to refuse them [evidence from jurors impeaching a verdict] without violating the plainest principles of justice." *United States v. Reid*, 12 How. 361, 366 (1851).

The Circuit Court at bar perceived that "freedom of jury deliberations is less threatened by impeachment of partial verdicts. . . ." The Court found, however, that petitioner desired "scrutiny of the deliberations." This is inaccurate. The evidence of want of unanimity was voluntarily placed before the Court by jurors. No "scrutiny" was necessary or appropriate. Rather, given the facts revealed, the appropriate remedy would have been either to set the verdict aside or to request the jury to deliberate further. *See* pp. 22-23, *infra*.<sup>14</sup>

The Second Circuit principally based its holding that F.R.E. Rule 606(b) was applicable upon the reasoning that the interest in verdict finality "would be enhanced by *extending* the rule against impeachment to partial verdicts. . . ." (emphasis added).

While the catchphrase "verdict finality" appears in many recent enunciations of the no-impeachment rule, the precise interest has never been defined. Petitioner suggests there is no interest in verdict finality *per se*, but rather that the term exists only to establish that point in time, or judicial act, after which impeachment by certain types of evidence will be prohibited, in the interests of protecting jurors from harassment and preserving the secrecy of the deliberative process.

Numerous decisions and learned commentators have indicated that the no-impeachment rule relates to evidence obtained *after* the jury is discharged. These opinions conflict with the ruling below. *See United States v. Cherton*, 309 F.2d 197, 200 (6th Cir. 1962), *cert. denied*, 372 U.S.

---

<sup>14</sup> The Trial Judge's instructions to the jurors, which the Second Circuit termed "somewhat ambiguous" (A-15, n.20), indeed suggested redeliberation. The jury as a whole, however, was not so charged.



936 (1963); *United States v. Schroeder*, 433 F.2d 846, 851 (8th Cir. 1971), *cert. denied*, 400 U.S. 1024 (1971); *Cherensky v. George Washington-East Motor Lodge*, 317 F. Supp. 1401 (E.D. Pa. 1970). As Professor Moore stated:

“[P]rior to the jury’s discharge there is nothing in the policy underlying the no-impeachment rule, presently considered, to preclude a juror from testifying relative to misconduct or other matters that might vitiate the verdict.” 6A Moore’s *Federal Practice* ¶59.08[4], at 59-143 (2d ed. 1974).

Similarly, Wigmore writes:

“The reasons for the foregoing rule, namely, the dangers of uncertainty and of tampering with jurors to procure testimony, disappear in large part if such investigation as may be desired is *made by the judge* and takes place *before* the jurors’ discharge and separation.” 8 Wigmore, *Evidence* § 2350, at 691 (McNaughton ed. 1961) (emphasis in original).

See also 3 Weinstein’s *Evidence* ¶ 606[04], at 606-28 (1975); ABA, *Standards Relating To Trial By Jury*, Commentary to § 5.7, at 137: “Finally, it should be emphasized that the restrictions in Section 5.7(a) apply to inquiry after the jury has been discharged . . . .”

Where, as in the instant case, jury bias has manifested itself prior to deliberations, there is particular reason to admit and consider pre-discharge record evidence of further misconduct. See 3 Weinstein’s *Evidence* ¶ 606[04], at 606-35 (1975); *Clark v. United States*, 289 U.S. 1 (1933).

Moreover, where evidence is offered, *inter alia*, to prove that no unanimous verdict was rendered, it has repeatedly been held admissible. *Fox v. United States*, 417 F.2d 84

(5th Cir. 1969); *cf.*, *Grace Lines, Inc. v. Motley*, 439 F.2d 1028 (2d Cir. 1971), discussed *infra*, p. 21.

*Jorgensen v. York Ice Machinery Corporation*, 160 F.2d 432 (2d Cir. 1947), supports the interpretation of Rule 606(b) urged by petitioner. In *Jorgensen*, although the Court declined to set aside the civil verdict where there was evidence the verdict was achieved by compromise, the Court accepted as evidence the post-discharge juror affidavits, noting that:

“[J]udges again and again repeat the consecrated rubric [the no-impeachment rule] which has so confused the subject; it offers an easy escape from embarrassing choices.” *Id.* at 435.

The undeniable interest in establishing the point in the judicial process after which impeachment by certain types of evidence will be prohibited is not impaired by permitting impeachment prior to discharge. Where the jury is sequestered, harassment is unlikely. Separation during deliberations is rarely permitted, 8A Moore's *Federal Practice* ¶ 31.06, at 31-47, 31-48 (1977 Revision), and under some circumstances may be plain error. *See United States v. Breland*, 376 F.2d 721 (2d Cir. 1967). In addition if pre-discharge impeachment were permitted, any inquiry would be made by the judge with due avoidance of protected areas. 8 Wigmore, *Evidence* § 2350, at 691 (McNaughton ed. 1961).

**B. There Was Sufficient Evidence of Misconduct And Lack of Unanimity At Bar.**

In *Grace Lines, Inc. v. Motley*, 439 F.2d 1028 (2d Cir. 1971), a juror responded during polling: “Yes, it [the verdict] had to be unanimous.” *Id.* at 1030. The Court



promptly declared a mistrial. In reversing, the Circuit Court stated:

“While it may be argued that Juror No. 11’s explanation implied a disagreement with the verdict, there is not sufficient [sic] in the record to warrant this conclusion. . . . *There is nothing to indicate that she was surrendering a conscientious conviction.*” *Id.* at 1032 (emphasis added).

By necessary implication, where there is evidence that jurors surrendered their honest convictions, a mistrial must be declared.<sup>15</sup>

In *United States v. Pleva*, 66 F.2d 529 (2d Cir. 1933), the jury had deliberated for one and one-half days when an elderly juror stated in open court that he was ill and that he doubted that a conspiracy had been proven. A doctor examined the juror and found him sufficiently healthy to continue deliberations. A second doctor examined the juror, with the same result. Arrangements were made for deliberations to be held under conditions minimizing the juror’s pain. Several hours later, a verdict was rendered. *After* the jury had been polled, the juror indicated that he had assented because he felt unable physically to hold out his dissenting opinion.

In reversing, the Circuit Court wrote:

“No person may lawfully be convicted by a jury unless every juror actually agrees that upon the evidence and the law of the case that person is guilty. If a verdict of guilty is returned for any other reason, it is a perversion of the constitutional guaranty to a jury trial.” *Id.* at 532.

---

<sup>15</sup> Indeed, the Trial Judge at bar so indicated when he stated prior to the interview with the jurors: “I am not going to let it [the verdict] stand if I am satisfied that this lady as she says it was pressured into doing it. Don’t worry about that.” (T. 5923).

At bar, at least two jurors indicated that they never actually agreed that Easton was guilty and that they were never persuaded "on the merits." *Pleva, supra* at 533. See also *United States v. Grieco*, 261 F.2d 414 (2d Cir. 1958), cert. denied, 359 U.S. 907 (1959); *Kingsport Utilities, Inc. v. Lamson*, 257 F.2d 553 (6th Cir. 1958); *Fox v. United States*, 417 F.2d 84 (5th Cir. 1969) (one juror stood mute during the polling; the Court remanded for a new trial on the ground that no unanimous verdict had been reached).<sup>16</sup>

This result is inevitable in the instant situation in view of the non-waivable constitutional mandate requiring unanimity of verdict. *Apodaca v. Oregon, supra*; *Andres v. United States*, 333 U.S. 740 (1948).

**C. At The Least, The Jury Should Have Been Directed To Redeliberate.**

In *Grace Lines, supra*, the Second Circuit held that under the circumstances, and even though there was no evidence the juror surrendered her conscientious conviction, the Court should have sent the jury back for further deliberations. *Id.* at 1032. Similarly, in *Williams v. United States*, 419 F.2d 740 (D.C. Cir. 1969) (*en banc*), during the polling, one juror indicated confusion. The Circuit Court approved the Trial Judge's action in sending the jury back to redeliberate. Accord, *United States v. Fox*, 488 F.2d 1093 (5th Cir. 1973), cert. denied, 417 U.S. 948 (1974); *United States v. Sexton*, 456 F.2d 961 (5th Cir. 1971); *Cook v. United States*, 379 F.2d 996 (5th Cir. 1967); *Bruce v. Chestnut Farms-Chevy Chaise Dairy*, 126 F.2d 224 (D.C. Cir. 1946); F.R.Cr.P. Rule 31(d).

It is submitted that the trial Court erred in failing to direct redeliberation. Although during its colloquy the Court directed Jurors Number Three and Four to consider

---

<sup>16</sup> In *Fox*, the Court found juror affidavits admissible to prove the absence of unanimity.

the question of Eastan's guilt *de novo* with the rest of the jury, no such instruction was given to the other jurors or to the jury as a whole, and the jury was never polled again as to Easton's guilt on Count One before being discharged. The jury not having been so instructed and no further poll having been taken, reversal is mandated.<sup>17</sup>

## II.

### **Opinions Expressed By The Second Circuit In The Instant Case Conflict With The Opinions Of Other Circuits In Vital Areas Concerning The Administration Of Criminal Justice.**

#### **A. The Court Declined to Rule Upon The Propriety Of — A Trial Court's Private Instruction of Jurors.**

As set forth at pp. 8-11, *supra*, the Trial Judge gave private instruction to Jurors Number Three and Four. Petitioner contended before the Second Circuit that such private instruction was prejudicial error. This point, raised by petitioner below, was not addressed in the Circuit Court's opinion. Therefore, that court must be deemed to have approved the procedure of a private interview and instruction, as to a vital issue in the trial, under circumstances where the procedure was harmful to petitioner, as a defendant.

---

<sup>17</sup> The Second Circuit determined that petitioner waived this objection by failing to request a further poll prior to discharge. However, the motion to set aside was then before the Court and just prior to discharging the jury the Court indicated no further objections or motions in that connection were necessary (T. 6020). The Circuit Court also placed unwarranted emphasis upon the fact that the jurors did not again voice their reservations. However the jurors expected the Judge to speak with them again, as he had promised, and, when the jury was discharged without such interview, the two jurors again sought to speak with the Court.

A contrary rule has been enunciated in the Third and Fourth Circuits. In *United States v. Gullia*, 450 F.2d 777 (3d Cir. 1971), one defendant was charged with eleven counts and the other with one count of aiding and abetting a bank teller in embezzling funds from her employer and with obstruction of the FBI investigation thereof. The trial lasted fourteen days. Deliberations commenced on a Friday. The Judge, who was required to be out-of-town, left instructions that any verdict reached should be sealed. A sealed verdict was returned at 7:35 p.m. When the Court reconvened the following Monday, and during the reading of the verdict, one juror interrupted and asked to speak with the Judge. The Judge consulted counsel, who approved of the Court's intention to interview the juror.

All counsel were present during the interview. The reviewing court summarized the transcript of the interview as follows:

“[T]he juror had agreed to the sealed verdict with some reluctance; the juror, in the interim, had discussed the case and the verdict with her husband; the juror had some religious scruples about sitting in judgment upon another; the juror had been unable to sleep since the verdict was sealed . . .; the trial judge correctly instructed the juror, again and again, during the conference upon the meaning of ‘aids, abets, counsels, commands, induces or procures’; . . . in response to the juror’s question ‘ . . . [w]hat would happen, Judge, if I held out?’, the trial judge answered: ‘ . . . [i]t would mean that we have just wasted two weeks, that is all.’ Upon objection . . . his revised reply was: ‘It would just be a misemployment of time.’ ” *Id.* at 778-9.

Thereafter, in open court, the Judge repeated his instructions (a) as to aiding and abetting, (b) that the verdict must be unanimous, and (c) that one juror need not be guided by the majority. The jury withdrew to deliberate further. Guilty verdicts were thereafter rendered on all counts as to both defendants.

The Third Circuit reversed and remanded, holding that the Trial Judge erred in privately interviewing the juror, stating:

“[I]t was not only irregular, but error to give additional instructions to the extent and of the type here given to one juror in the absence of the remaining jurors.” *Id.* at 779.

In *United States v. Rabb*, 450 F.2d (3d Cir. 1971), *cert. denied*, 405 U.S. 995 (1972), and *Beaty v. United States*, 213 F.2d 712, 722 (4th Cir. 1954), *cert. denied*, 348 U.S. 905 (1955), the Third and Fourth Circuits suggested in their opinions that it was improper for the Trial Court to communicate with any individual juror, a rule of law which precludes the giving of private instructions to any individual juror or jurors.<sup>18</sup>

**B. The Supplemental Instructions Given By The Trial Judge To Two Jurors Were Tantamount To an Allen Charge As To Use of Which The Circuit Courts Are Divided.**

During his interview with Jurors Number Three and Four, the Trial Judge, in his self-identified effort to “salvage” the verdict (T. 5921), at first sought to minimize the jurors’ statements of discontent. When Juror Number Four commented that three or four jurors had been rail-

---

<sup>18</sup> In *Beaty*, the Court found the communication with the foreman not to be prejudicial because solely related to a beneficial recommendation as to sentencing.

roaded into a verdict as to Easton (T. 5930-1), the Court abruptly turned to Juror Number Three, indicating that her statements evinced "an emotional problem" (T. 5931). When Juror Number Three indicated that she had surrendered her honest conviction of Easton's innocence, the Court commented "You think you did." (T. 5931). Thereafter, the Court indicated that the jurors should redeliberate as to Easton (T. 5932-3). One can never know whether such redeliberation occurred, as the jury was never again polled as to Easton on Count One.

The impact of the two juror interview was akin to that of an *Allen* charge.<sup>19</sup> The Court's direction that the two jurors continue to deliberate, coupled with the failure to charge the jury at large either to reopen consideration of Count One as to Easton or to give proper deference and regard to their fellow jurors' opinions, particularly when coupled with the Trial Judge's laissez-faire attitude toward the evidence of misconduct among the jurors and their lack of unanimity, may also be likened in coercive effect to an improperly given *Allen* charge. The composite was so coercive as to vitiate the subsequent conviction on Count Two, which followed soon after the private interview.

The Second Circuit itself has directed the exercise of extreme caution in giving *Allen*-type charges. Thus, in *United States v. Robinson*, 544 F.2d 611 (2d Cir. 1976), the Court noted that when the Judge is aware of the numerical split of the jury, and the jury is aware of the Court's knowledge, the giving of an *Allen* charge is a "precarious undertaking" because the effect is "unavoidably to add the Judge's influence to the side of the majority. . . ." *Id.* at 620, n.14, quoting *Mullin v. United States*, 356 F.2d 368, 370

---

<sup>19</sup> See *Allen v. United States*, 164 U.S. 492 (1896). The remaining jurors assuredly were aware that Jurors Number Three and Four had met with Judge Bonsal, as the interview occurred after the jury was assembled on the morning of February 16, 1976 (T. 5920).



(4th Cir. 1966). At bar, the Court was obviously aware of the numerical division and it seems reasonably evident that the jury was also aware of the Judge's knowledge thereof. The return of Jurors Number Three and Four to the jury room, *without* the giving of any instruction to the jury as a whole and *with* the instruction to the two jurors that they resume deliberations is, if anything, more coercive than the rendering of an evenly balanced, supplementary instruction to all jurors. See *United States v. Green*, 523 F.2d 229 (2d Cir. 1975), *cert. denied*, 423 U.S. 1074 (1976).

The Second Circuit seems to have retained, but only in the "barest margin", the doctrine that the giving of an *Allen* charge may be proper. See *United States v. Kenner*, 354 F.2d 780 (2d Cir. 1965), *cert. denied*, 383 U.S. 958 (1966), and *Robinson, supra*. The Fifth Circuit follows a similar doctrine, although its key recent decision based its ruling solely upon *stare decisis*, and commented that the charge was inherently coercive. See *United States v. Bailey*, 468 F.2d 652 (5th Cir. 1972), *reh. en banc*, 480 F.2d 518 (5th Cir. 1973).<sup>20</sup>

The continued use of *Allen* type charges is thus the subject of substantial disagreement among the Circuits. The conflict should be resolved by this Court. Particularly, in light of the coercive impact of the events surrounding the Trial Judge's private interview with two jurors and of the brief time elapsed in deliberations prior to return of the verdict as to Count Two, petitioner urges that the case at

---

<sup>20</sup> The Court wrote:

"We deeply regret being compelled to affirm this conviction. We do so only because we are bound by precedent. [Citation omitted]. Were the choice ours alone to make, we would put an end to the *Allen* charge in a 'quick and not too decent burial'" *Bailey*, 468 F.2d at 669.

bar affords a significant opportunity for reviewing the propriety of an *Allen* charge.<sup>21</sup> Petitioner respectfully suggests that the inherently coercive character of this type of jury instruction raises serious questions as to trial fairness, which this Court should review. It is time to consider for the federal judicial system, as a whole, whether the Fifth Circuit is not correct in its conclusion that this Draconian, nineteenth century procedure should be given its final interment. *Bailey, supra* at 669.

### III.

#### **Hockridge and Easton Were Denied the Right to A Proper Poll of the Jury.**

As stated in *Miranda v. United States*, 255 F.2d 9, 17 (1st Cir. 1958):

“The right of the defendant to have the jury polled, as thus recognized and established by Rule 31(d) [of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure], is of ancient origin and of basic importance.”

Denial of the right constitutes reversible error. *Miranda, supra* at 18.

---

<sup>21</sup> In the case at bar, the Court's charge also included a modified *Pinkerton* instruction. See *Pinkerton v. United States*, 328 U.S. 640 (1946). This was improper since at the time when the jurors deliberated on Count Two, the conspiracy verdict had not been set aside. Jurors Number Three and Four were under instructions to continue to deliberate. It is quite possible that, in deliberating, the jury applied the *Pinkerton* charge to find Easton guilty on Count Two. In view of the fact that the Count One conviction was not unanimous (see pp. 21-22, *supra*), such charge was inappropriate. Hence, the Count Two conviction is subject to serious doubts for this reason as well as the other circumstances set forth herein.



Moreover, as stated in *United States v. Mathis*, 535 F.2d 1303, 1307 (D.C. Cir. 1976):

“Since jury polls are a matter where ‘the need for clarity is at its zenith,’ *Williams v. United States*, 136 U.S. App.D.C. 158, 419 F.2d 740 (1969) (en banc), the court should shape the form of the poll so as to minimize possible confusion by the jurors.”

In *Mathis*, the Court further wrote:

“The form used here—a single poll for multiple [there, two] defendants—may entail risks of confusion, especially in complicated cases. If the same verdict is reached for all defendants, there is the possibility that a single poll would fail to uncover situations where the jury convicted all defendants although only persuaded beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of some. Where different verdicts are reached as to various defendants, a single poll could hide a juror’s confusion . . .” *Id.* at 1307.

At bar, the partial verdict as to Count One found Hockridge, Petri and Easton all guilty. The poll taken was as to all defendants collectively. There can be little question that the poll as taken masked confusion. Not only did Jurors Number Three and Four later revealed their dissent from the verdict as to Easton, but Juror Number Four stated:

“I know that at the time when we were polled that I should have said no . . . on Easton.” (T. 5930-1).

In fact, by reason of the form of the polling, *i.e.*, the fact that separate polling was not made of the jurors as to Count One, Juror Number Four had no opportunity to state her true view that Easton was not guilty of this Count.

Contrariwise, the Courts of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the Seventh Circuit and Third Circuit have in recent decisions explicitly disapproved the use of an *Allen* charge. See *United States v. Thomas*, 449 F.2d 1177 (D.C. Cir. 1971) (the District of Columbia Circuit prospectively abandoned the use of the *Allen* charge (*Id.* at 1187)); *United States v. Brown*, 411 F.2d 930 (7th Cir. 1969), *cert. denied*, 396 U.S. 1017 (1970); and *United States v. Fioravanti*, 412 F.2d 407 (3rd Cir. 1969), *cert. denied*, 396 U.S. 837 (1969).

### CONCLUSION

#### **The Writ of Certiorari Should be Granted.**

Respectfully submitted,

IRVING ANOLIK


*Attorney for Petitioner, Hockridge*

225 Broadway

New York, N. Y. 10007

212-732-3050

## **APPENDICES**



## Appendix A

### Judgment and Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals For the Second Circuit

Entered March 27, 1978

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

---

Nos. 441, 443, 522—September Term, 1977.

(Argued December 14, 1977      Decided March 27, 1978.)

Docket Nos. 77-1243, -1258, -1285

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Appellee,

v.

WILLIAM H. HOCKRIDGE, CHARLES PETRI  
and STEPHEN K. EASTON,

Appellants.

---

Before:

OAKES and VAN GRAAFEILAND, *Circuit Judges*,  
and BARTELS, *District Judge*.<sup>\*</sup>

---

Appeal from judgments of conviction entered after a jury trial in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, Dudley B. Ponsal, *Judge*. All three appellants were convicted of violating 18 U.S.C. § 371 under Count I and 18 U.S.C. §§ 656 and 2 under Count II. Petri was also convicted under 18 U.S.C. § 1014.

---

<sup>\*</sup> Of the Eastern District of New York, sitting by designation.

*Appendix A*

Judgments affirmed.

---

IRVING ANOLIK, New York, N.Y., *for Appellant Hockridge.*

ROBERT S. COHEN, LANS FEINBERG & COHEN, New York, N.Y. (Deborah E. Lans, New York, N.Y., of counsel), *for Appellant Easton.*

DANIEL J. KORNSTEIN, New York, N.Y., *for Appellant Petri.*

DOMINIC F. AMOROSA, Assistant United States Attorney (Robert B. Fiske, Jr., United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, David W. O'Connor, Richard Weinberg, Assistant United States Attorneys, of counsel), *for Appellee.*

---

OAKES, *Circuit Judge:*

The principal issue raised in this appeal is the propriety of the district court's refusal to permit two jurors to impeach a partial verdict. Questions of sufficiency of the evidence with respect to appellant Hockridge, jury bias, adequacy of the conspiracy instructions, purported withholding of evidence by the Government, and erroneous evidentiary rulings are also presented, but each merits only limited discussion.

Appellants Hockridge, Petri and Easton challenge the judgments of conviction entered after an eight-week jury trial in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York before Dudley B. Bonsal, *Judge*. Under Count One of the indictment all three appellants

*Appendix A*

were convicted of conspiracy<sup>1</sup> (a) to misapply moneys of the Chemical Bank (Chemical), Hockridge's employer, (b) to prepare and submit false financial statements for the purpose of obtaining loans from Chemical and from the Bank of New York, and (c) to make false entries in Chemical's books and reports. They also were found guilty of a substantive count—Count Two—charging misapplication and assisting in the misapplication of approximately \$1,145,000 in Chemical funds.<sup>2</sup> Petri, the owner of various shell companies and a borrower from Chemical, was also convicted of substantive Count Eight for preparing a false financial statement of the Oceanic Drug Co. for the purpose of influencing Chemical to loan \$75,000 to that company.<sup>3</sup> Hockridge and Easton were acquitted on the Oceanic Drug count, as were all three appellants on Counts Three, Four, Ten through Fourteen, Seventeen, Twenty and Twenty-one. The jury was discharged on February 18, 1977, without having reached verdicts on the remaining counts.<sup>4</sup>

## I. FACTS

From September, 1971, through the middle of June, 1972, Petri borrowed in excess of \$1,300,00 from Chemi-

---

<sup>1</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 371.

<sup>2</sup> 18 U.S.C. §§ 656, 2.

<sup>3</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1014.

<sup>4</sup> On April 12, 1977, Hockridge was sentenced on Count One to nine months' imprisonment and on Count Two to a three-year suspended sentence with probation to commence upon his release from confinement. Petri was sentenced to four years' imprisonment on each of Counts One and Two and two years' imprisonment on Count Eight, all sentences to run concurrently. On June 15, 1977, Easton received six months' imprisonment and a fine of \$5,000 on Count One. On Count Two his sentence was suspended and he was given three years' probation to commence following his release from confinement.



*Appendix A*

cal.<sup>5</sup> On over twenty occasions, loans were made to worthless corporations owned in whole or in part by a "mini-conglomerate" controlled by Petri known after November 24, 1971, as Cine-Prime Corp. Chemical ultimately lost over \$1,100,000 on these loans.

Petri effected his scheme with the assistance of Hockridge who, as an assistant vice president and loan officer at Chemical, used his authority<sup>6</sup> to grant unsecured loans to Petri's corporations. Petri originally enticed Hockridge into the conspiracy by satisfying \$35,000 in loans which the latter had previously approved to one Daniel Sheddrick.<sup>7</sup> Petri subsequently paid off \$23,000 in overdue personal loans that Hockridge had approved to a codefendant, George Whitney. Petri also remunerated Hockridge more directly by diverting \$14,000 of a \$75,000 loan Hockridge had approved for one of Petri's companies to Hockridge's checking account in March, 1972.<sup>8</sup> Petri also provided Hockridge with other bribes and gratuities including, but

---

<sup>5</sup> The \$1,300,000 total does not include "roll-over" loans. Roll-over loans are those in which the proceeds of a new loan are used, at least in part, to pay off an old one.

<sup>6</sup> The ceiling on his authority was \$50,000 from September, 1971, to March 6, 1972, and then \$75,000 from the latter date to June, 1972, when the scheme was discovered and Hockridge was dismissed.

<sup>7</sup> The payment to Sheddrick is revealing. Hockridge approved a \$75,000 loan to Oceanic Drug Co. and a \$35,000 payment to Cord Automobile Co., two of Petri's companies. Hockridge removed \$35,000 from the Oceanic checking account and deposited the moneys in the Cord account. A check was then drawn on the Cord account by Petri, and Easton payable to Sheddrick.

<sup>8</sup> The \$14,000 payoff was made when Hockridge authorized a \$75,000 loan to Todays Stores Services, Inc. Hockridge then approved a \$14,000 Chemical check payable to the Central Jersey Bank and Trust Co. where he maintained a bank account. He covered the Chemical check by withdrawing \$14,000 from the Todays Stores Services' account.

### Appendix A

not limited to, stock in Cine-Prime Corp. held by a nominee, a \$3,000 mink coat for Hockridge's wife, sexual favors of a woman paid for the purpose, a pool table and gold clubs.

For all but two of the corporate loans approved by Hockridge, Easton, an officer in several of Petri's worthless companies, prepared unsigned corporate financial statements submitted to Chemical. Some of these listed non-existent assets. For example, Cord Automobile Co., acquire in bankruptcy for \$100, was shown to have more than \$260,000 in assets. One statement, that of Today's Stores Services, was dated even before the corporation was formed. Others were false in various particulars.

## II. DISCUSSION

### A. Sufficiency as to Hockridge

Only Hockridge disputes the sufficiency of the Government's proof. Viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the Government, *Glasse, United States*, 315 U.S. 60, 80 (1942); *United States v. Alcone*, 544 F.2d 607, 610 (2d Cir. 1976), *cert. denied*, 4 U.S. 916 (1977), we conclude that the evidence supports Hockridge's conviction on both the conspiracy and the substantive counts.

The Government's proof at trial focused on four areas. First, the evidence permitted the jury to find that Hockridge knew that the financial statements submitted on behalf of Petri's corporations were false.<sup>9</sup> Second, the jury

---

<sup>9</sup> He admonished one witness to "tell Petri and Easton to come down off some of these wild balance sheets."

*Appendix A*

properly could have found that Hockridge completed false or fictitious documents in connection with several of the loans.<sup>10</sup> Third, the Government's proof demonstrated that Hockridge knowingly violated the bank's "group credits rule" by approving loans in excess of his credit authority to two or more corporations controlled by the same party without approval of other lending officers. And finally, Hockridge received the substantial bribes and gratuities detailed above.<sup>11</sup> Clearly, the evidence was more than sufficient.

*B. Alleged Jury Bias or Misconduct*

All three appellants assert that the jury was infected with prejudice before the deliberations even began. On the fifth day of an eight-week trial, Juror Number Three reported to the judge that several other jurors had remarked that the defendants were guilty. She noted, however, that the jurors were "not speaking about the case per se," whatever that meant. The district judge proceeded to interview each juror individually in camera. Several said that they had heard nothing of the kind, although six reported that someone had made a passing reference, in jest, to the subject of the defendants' guilt. Each averred that he or she would not form any opinion

---

<sup>10</sup> On more than one occasion Hockridge falsely stated that certain loans would be used for working capital or for legitimate business investments when in fact the money was used to pay off personal loans or loans made to other companies.

<sup>11</sup> Hockridge's subsequent report to the bank that he had received no "gratuities, payments or secret benefits" from Petri or his group failed to mention the \$14,000 payoff, *see* note 8 and accompanying text *supra*, and belied Hockridge's testimony that the transaction was really a loan from Petri to be used to buy stock.

*Appendix A*

of guilt or innocence until all the evidence was presented. Each further recognized the necessity of not talking about the case.

In treating charges of jury misconduct, the trial judge is accorded broad discretion. *United States v. Panebianco*, 543 F.2d 447, 457 (2d Cir. 1976), *cert. denied*, 429 U.S. 1103 (1977); *United States v. Flynn*, 216 F. 2d 354, 372 (2d Cir. 1954), *cert. denied*, 348 U.S. 909 (1955); *see Note, The United States Courts of Appeals: 1975-1976 Term Criminal Law and Procedure*, 65 Geo. L.J. 203, 370-71 (1976). A criminal trial is of course no place for bias or prejudice, even "in jest." And faced with the threat of bias, Judge Bonsal acted properly in conducting the in camera interviews. If one juror had been contaminated, the district judge's prompt action could have contained any spread of the taint. *United States v. Torres*, 519 F.2d 723, 727-28 (2d Cir.) ("expeditious" voir dire after defendants seen in handcuffs minimized harm where all jurors but one assured judge of continuing impartiality; unsure juror excused), *cert. denied*, 423 U.S. 1019 (1975); *cf. United States v. Lord*, 565 F.2d 831, 837-39 (2d Cir. 1977) (in camera individual interrogation of juror exposed to prejudicial publicity during trial required); *United States v. Pfingst*, 477 F.2d 177, 186 (2d Cir.) (individual jurors examined on exposure to prejudicial publicity), *cert. denied*, 412 U.S. 941 (1973); *but cf. United States v. Taylor*, 562 F.2d 1345, 1359-60 (2d Cir.) (omission to conduct individual voir dire where jury may have seen defendants in manacles not plain error), *cert. denied sub nom. Salley v. United States*, 97 S. Ct. 2958 (1977).

Likewise, on the basis of the jurors' interview statements, it was not an abuse of discretion to continue the trial upon concluding that the jurors were not prejudiced,

*Appendix A*

a determination which the district judge was in the best position to make. See *United States v. Bando*, 244 F.2d 833, 838 (2d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 355 U.S. 844 (1957); cf. *United States v. Chiarizio*, 525 F.2d 289, 293 (2d Cir. 1975) (factual findings at pretrial suppression hearing are reversible on appeal only if clearly erroneous); 3 C. Wright, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 678, at 143 (1969) (same).

*C. Juror Impeachment of Partial Verdict*

Appellants' principal contention is best understood in its specific factual context. The jury began deliberations on Friday morning, February 11, 1977, and continued until 9:30 that evening. Reconvening on Monday morning, February 14, it deliberated until about 6:30 p.m. when the court informed counsel that it would exercise its prerogative under Rule 31(b) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure<sup>12</sup> to ask the jury whether it had reached a par-

---

<sup>12</sup> Rule 31(b) provides:

Several Defendants. If there are two or more defendants, the jury at any time during its deliberations may return a verdict or verdicts with respect to a defendant or defendants as to whom it has agreed; if the jury cannot agree with respect to all, the defendant or defendants as to whom it does not agree may be tried again.

Fed. R. Crim. P. 31(b). In explicating Rule 31(b), Professor Wright states that

the jury, at any time during its deliberations, may return one or more verdicts on those counts or defendants on which it is agreed. It may then retire again and resume its deliberations about the remaining charges [citing, *inter alia*, *United States v. Conti*, 361 F.2d 153 (2d Cir. 1966), *vacated and remanded on other grounds sub nom. Stone v. United States*, 390 U.S. 204 (1968)] . . . . In permitting the practice here described, Rule 31(b) is in accord with the prior law [citing, *inter alia*, *United States v. Frankel*, 65 F.2d 235 (2d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 290 U.S. 682 (1933)].

*Appendix A*

tial verdict. The jurors responded affirmatively, announcing their verdict of guilty on Count One. After the jurors were polled, the guilty verdicts were recorded. Deliberations resumed on Tuesday, February 15. At about 5:00 p.m., the judge received a note from Juror Number Four asking to see him, a request with which he did not immediately comply. The following morning at about 9:30 a.m. he received a note from Juror Number Three. She also sought a meeting with the judge, fearing that she had committed "a grave injustice" by rushing into the verdict.

With consent of counsel, the judge conducted an on-the-record in camera interview with Jurors Three and Four. During the questioning both jurors expressed their concern with the partial verdict. Juror Number Three believed that "there was not evidence to make [her] decide that Mr. Hockridge and Mr. Petri were involved in a conspiracy." Juror Number Four expressed doubts about Easton's guilt and indicated that she "felt like [at] the last minute we were railroaded. . . ." <sup>13</sup> The judge reminded the two jurors that he did not want them "ever to surrender [their] honest convictions." Juror Number Three replied that she thought she had done so "because of verbal attack." The judge urged her "to get hardened to that," to

---

2 C. Wright, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 513, at 368-69 (1969).

A guilty verdict may not be challenged on the basis that the jury is sent back for further deliberations on remaining counts after reaching a verdict on one or more counts. *United States v. Barash*, 412 F.2d 26, 31-32 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 396 U.S. 832 (1969); *McDonald v. Commonwealth*, 173 Mass. 322, 329, 53 N.E. 374, 375 (1899).

<sup>13</sup> She told the court that she had been "attacked incredibly" on the first day of deliberations but agreed with the judge that jury deliberations are often "emotional and high strung."



*Appendix A*

“think about this some more,” and to consider each defendant separately. He then said:

You did come in with a verdict on three of them. I would like you to think about that and resume your deliberations and then we'll see how it goes today with the deliberations and then perhaps after we finish here I will want to see you again.

JUROR No. 3: I don't understand what you mean. Continue the deliberating—

THE COURT: After the jury finishes, I think I will want to see you again and talk again about some of these things that you have told me this morning. But I think it would be wise if both of you could go back with the jurors.

The jurors then resumed deliberations and never again intimated any doubts of appellants' guilt on Count One. Indeed, they acquitted a codefendant on Count One that day. On Thursday, February 17, the jury announced its findings that the three appellants were guilty and a codefendant innocent on Count Two, and that all defendants were not guilty on Counts Three and Four. On the sixth and last day of deliberations, Friday, February 18, the jury announced partial verdicts of not guilty as to all three appellants on nine more counts with the exception of Petri who was found guilty on Count Eight. The jury was discharged without reaching verdicts on the remaining counts even though there was no indication that it was deadlocked.

In response to formal post-trial motions to set aside the verdicts, Judge Bonsal held that the jurors' in camera interview statements could not affect their verdict on Count One. Alternatively, the judge concluded that the



*Appendix A*

two jurors did not “surrender their honest convictions” in finding the appellants guilty on that count.

Challenging the district judge’s adverse ruling, appellants argue vigorously that the statements of the jurors were competent to impeach the verdict on Count One for essentially two reasons. First, the jury had not been discharged, thereby making Rule 606(b) of the Federal Rules of Evidence<sup>14</sup> inapposite. Second, when a juror has surrendered “a conscientious conviction” the verdict must be set aside since it was not unanimous. *Grace Lines, Inc. v. Motley*, 439 F.2d 1028, 1032 (2d Cir. 1971); see *United States v. Pleva*, 66 F.2d 529, 531-33 (2d Cir. 1933); 6A *Moore’s Federal Practice* ¶ 59.08[4], at 127-28 (1974).

Neither the cases nor the treatises definitively answer the question whether Rule 606(b) bars the impeachment of a partial verdict by the voluntary and spontaneous testimony of a juror prior to the jury’s discharge. In *Vizzini v. Ford Motor Co.*, 72 F.R.D. 132 (E.D. Pa. 1976), relied on by the Government, the jury returned a verdict of liability to a civil plaintiff which was recorded, but during deliberations on damages it revealed that the liability verdict was a compromise. The district court let the verdict on liability stand, relying on Rule 606(b), and submitted

---

<sup>14</sup> Fed. R. Evid. 606(b) states:

Inquiry into validity of verdict or indictment. Upon an inquiry into the validity of a verdict or indictment, a juror may not testify as to any matter or statement occurring during the course of the jury’s deliberations or to the effect of anything upon his or any other juror’s mind or emotions as influencing him to assent to or dissent from the verdict or indictment or concerning his mental processes in connection therewith except that a juror may testify on the question whether extraneous prejudicial information was improperly brought to the jury’s attention or whether any outside influence was improperly brought to bear upon any juror. Nor may his affidavit or evidence of any statement by him concerning a matter about which he would be precluded from testifying be received for these purposes.

## Appendix A

the question of damages to a new jury. The Third Circuit reversed, No. 76-2529 (3d Cir., filed Dec. 16, 1977), but reserved decision on the Rule 606(b) question, holding that the issues of liability and damages were so related as not to permit severability.<sup>15</sup> The appellants' cases are equally inconclusive.<sup>16</sup> Even the leading treatises ignore the relationship between Rule 606(b) and partial verdicts after which a jury continues its deliberations.<sup>17</sup>

To buttress appellants' purported distinction between impeachment of complete verdicts on the one hand and partial verdicts followed by continuing deliberations on the other, they suggest that the interests in protecting freedom

---

<sup>15</sup> We note that the level of symbiosis between liability and damages that existed in *Vizzini* ordinarily would not pertain to partial verdicts on separate counts of an indictment.

<sup>16</sup> In *United States v. Pleva*, 66 F.2d 529 (2d Cir. 1933), the conviction was reversed on appeal where a juror had informed the trial judge while the jury was being polled and before the verdict was recorded that he had voted for conviction because of his own illness. Here, of course, the jurors' statements were made *after* the verdict on Count One had been recorded. *Grace Lines, Inc. v. Motley*, 439 F.2d 1028 (2d Cir. 1971), is similarly unavailing. A juror's statement *on polling* that she had consented to the verdict in the interests of unanimity was insufficient to show surrender of an honest conviction. *Id.* at 1032 (Anderson, J.); *id.* at 1033-34 (Lumbard, J., concurring). See 6A *Moore's Federal Practice* ¶ 59.08[4], at 130 (1974). Many cases in this circuit state the usual rule that jurors' statements received *after* discharge may not be received to impeach the verdict. *E.g.*, *United States v. Grieco*, 261 F.2d 414, 415 (2d Cir. 1958) (per curiam) (juror intimidated by "blustering arrogance" of another juror), *cert. denied*, 359 U.S. 907 (1959); *Rotondo v. Isthmian S.S. Co.*, 243 F.2d 581, 583 (2d Cir.) (post-discharge statements explaining reasons for verdict are incompetent), *cert. denied*, 355 U.S. 834 (1957).

<sup>17</sup> See 6A *Moore's Federal Practice*, *supra* note 16, ¶ 59.08[4], at 123-52; 3 J. Weinstein & M. Merger, *Evidence* §§ 606[01]-[05], at 606-1-46; 8 Wigmore, *Evidence* §§ 2345-56 (McNaughton rev. ed. 1961); Wright, *supra* note 12, § 554, at 488-95; *The ABA Standards Relating to Trial by Jury* § 5.7 (Approved Draft 1968) [hereinafter ABA Standards].

*Appendix A*

of deliberation and freedom from post-verdict annoyance, embarrassment, or harassment are not implicated when the impeaching statements or incidents both occur and are inquired into by the court before the jury has been discharged.<sup>18</sup> Appellants' position, however, is defective for two reasons. First, it mischaracterizes the impeachment of partial verdicts as not implicating the jury's freedom of deliberation. And second, it overlooks another important interest served by the rule against verdict impeachment—verdict finality.

While the freedom of jury deliberations is less threatened by impeachment of partial verdicts than by impeachment of verdicts generally, it is, nevertheless, clearly impinged. The inquiry requested by appellants in this case is a prime example. It would have necessitated scrutiny of the deliberations of the jury including the mental processes of the jurors, a result inconsistent with the strictures of Rule 606(b). The legislative history of Rule 606(b), while perhaps not determinative, reveals the strong congressional purpose of protecting the jury deliberation process. The House version embodied a suggestion of the Advisory Committee of the Judicial Conference to delete the proscription against testimony on "any matter or statement occurring during the course of the jury's deliberations," previously adopted by the Supreme Court. It retained the prohibition against inquiry into the mental processes of the jurors. *See* H.R. Rep.

---

<sup>18</sup> Wigmore noted in a non-partial verdict context that "the dangers of uncertainty and of tampering with the jurors to procure testimony, disappear in large part if such investigation as may be desired is *made by the judge* and takes place *before the jurors' discharge* and separation." 8 Wigmore, *supra* note 17, § 2350, at 691 (emphasis in original). *See* ABA Standards, *supra* note 17, § 5.7(a), at 173. Wigmore points out, however, the danger of abuse from an overactive judge attempting to browbeat a jury out of its sincere conclusion, as in *Rex v. Shipley*, 21 How. St. Tr. 847, 950n, 951 (1784). *Wigmore, supra*, § 2350, at 692.

*Appendix A*

No. 93-650, 93d Cong., 1st Sess. 9-10 (1973). The Senate, however, thought any inquiry into internal deliberations of the jury unsound, and its report, citing *McDonald v. Pless*, 238 U.S. 264, 267 (1915), called for reinstatement of the proscription. S. Rep. No. 93-1277, 93d Cong., 2d Sess. 13-14 (1974). The Senate view ultimately prevailed. Similar considerations seemingly apply to a partial verdict; the policy against intrusion into internal deliberations remains the same. Furthermore, it must be assumed that in enacting the Federal Rules of Evidence Congress did not act in a vacuum, but rather had in mind the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, including Rule 31(b).

Appellants' position also fails to recognize the important interest in verdict finality which is furthered by Rule 606 (b). Finality obviously would be enhanced by extending the rule against impeachment to partial verdicts which have been recorded. A partial verdict should be given final effect since "[i]t would only promote irresponsible hesitation to tell [the jury] that they must reserve their decision altogether until they got through; the appellants had no right in [the jury's] subsequent vacillations." *United States v. Cotter*, 60 F.2d 689, 690 (2d Cir.) (L. Hand, J.), *cert. denied*, 287 U.S. 666 (1932). The reason for taking a partial verdict is apparent in cases where there has been a long trial and there exists the prospect of long deliberations. By taking a partial verdict, the court is able to hedge against the possibility of juror illness or death or prejudice by publicity. Of course, finality is not sought for its own sake. But where a partial verdict has been recorded, we perceive no reasons of sufficient magnitude to depart from the normal rules gov-

*Appendix A*

erning impeachment of jury verdicts.<sup>19</sup> A recorded partial verdict ought not to be disturbed absent a showing of the type which would permit impeachment of a complete verdict.

In this particular case Judge Bonsal entered into a discussion with the two jurors which to some extent implied that they might, along with the other jurors reconsider the recorded verdict. To the extent that this may have been error, it was harmless.

After the in camera interviews with Judge Bonsal, the two jurors joined the others in verdicts of guilt and innocence on a number of counts. At no point did they again voice any reservation with respect to appellants' conviction on Count One. The appellants argue that Judge Bonsal's conduct in dealing with the two jurors had the effect of coercing them into giving up reasonable doubts they may have had about appellants' guilt in subsequent deliberations. This contention might have some merit if Judge Bonsal's in camera conduct had in any way been coercive, but his management of this difficult and novel

---

<sup>19</sup> A partial verdict still requires the affirmative act of assenting to a verdict either by express answer to the clerk at polling in open court or by silence which implies assent. See 8 Wigmore, *supra* note 17, § 2355, at 717. "The record of a verdict implies a unanimous consent of the jury, and is conclusive and incontrovertible evidence of the fact," *Grinnell v. Phillips*, 1 Mass. 529, 542 (1805). Although here there was no individual polling, none was requested. Appellants, therefore, waived the right. See *Humphries v. District of Columbia*, 174 U.S. 190, 194-95 (1899); *United States v. Dye*, 61 F. Supp. 457, 459 (W.D. Ky. 1945); ABA Standards, *supra* note 17, § 5.5; cf. *Hernandez v. Delgado*, 375 F.2d 584 (1st Cir. 1967) (no violation of due process to infer waiver of right to poll jury from silence).

*Appendix A*

situation was the opposite of coercive.<sup>20</sup> We emphasize, however, that in the future the appropriate action of the trial judge faced with a similar request by a juror to reconsider a prior recorded partial verdict should be to advise the juror simply that such a verdict is final, avoiding the discussion engaged in here.

*D. Other Issues*

Appellants' remaining contentions require scant comment. Hockridge asserts that the Government failed to reveal an ongoing investigation of a "money-washing" operation in several Chemical branches in violation of *Brady v. Maryland*.<sup>21</sup> The inquiry centered on Chemical's failure to comply with federal currency requirements. How this entirely unrelated investigation would have tended to create a reasonable doubt of Hockridge's guilt is not demonstrated. Absent such a showing, no new trial is required. *United States v. Agurs*, 427 U.S. 97, 112-13 (1976).

---

<sup>20</sup> Concededly, the district judge's directions to the two jurors were somewhat ambiguous. *Ante* at 2141. If he was urging the jurors to deliberate further on Count One, we believe that under the view we have taken of Rule 606(b)'s application to partial verdicts, the district judge exceeded his authority. Appellants could not complain of that error, however, since it was favorable to their position.

In any event, Judge Bonsal's instructions were clearly non-coercive. True, he did not discuss the matter further with the jurors, as he told them he would do. But there did not appear to be any need for additional communications as the jury deliberations progressed. Moreover, although appellants moved to set aside the verdict and for a mistrial when counsel were informed of the colloquy between the judge and the two jurors, no objection to the judge's failure later to discuss the verdict was ever lodged, nor did appellants ever request redeliberation by the entire jury on Count One. Accordingly, they would have to abide the result reached here even if the recorded partial verdict was not, by virtue of the trial judge's discussion with the two jurors, entitled to final effect.

<sup>21</sup> 373 U.S. 83 (1963).



*Appendix A*

Hockridge argues that the court failed adequately to explain to the jury the “thrust of the conspiracy count,” Brief for Appellant Hockridge at 34, urging that he was at most a “casual facilitator,” *id.* at 28. See *United States v. Hysohion*, 448 F.2d 343, 347 (2d Cir. 1971). We find that the judge’s conspiracy charge<sup>22</sup> was proper under the authorities in this circuit<sup>23</sup> and that the evidence was clearly sufficient to implicate Hockridge as a participant in the scheme to defraud the bank.

Easton contends that the court improperly permitted proof of extraneous crimes committed by himself and Petri. Specifically the Government offered proof to show that Easton and Petri failed to withhold requisite taxes from corporate employees. However, this evidence tended to show how the conspiracy operated by suggesting that the Petri corporations were simply shells formed to obtain loans. As such the evidence was plainly admissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 404(b),<sup>24</sup> without creating undue

---

<sup>22</sup> The court charged that “a conspiracy is a combination or partnership, if you will, of two or more people to violate the law . . .” It also charged that the Government must prove

that at least two or more persons came to a mutual understanding for the purposes of accomplishing the unlawful plan or scheme described in the conspiracy count which I just read to you. Here, of course, the fact that the defendants knew each other or may have associated with each other or may have discussed mutual or common business interests, that isn’t enough to establish a conspiracy. Mere association isn’t enough.

<sup>23</sup> *E.g.*, *United States v. Rosenblatt*, 554 F.2d 36 (2d Cir. 1977); *United States v. Kahaner*, 317 F.2d 459, 474-82 (2d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 375 U.S. 836 (1963).

<sup>24</sup> Other crimes, wrongs, or acts. Evidence of other crimes, wrongs, or acts is not admissible to prove the character of a person in order to show that he acted in conformity therewith. It may, however, be admissible for other purposes, such as proof of motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, or absence of mistake or accident. Fed. R. Evid. 404(b).



*Appendix A*

prejudice, confusion or waste of time so as to be excludable under Rule 403.<sup>25</sup>

Easton also complains that the Government was erroneously permitted to cross-examine him on the increase of his net worth by over \$2,000,000 between 1972 and 1974. But he cannot complain now where he failed to object to this line of inquiry at trial. *United States v. Braunig*, 553 F.2d 777, 780 (2d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 431 U.S. 959 (1977). Moreover, there was proof that some of the Chemical loan proceeds were diverted to his personal checking account, although he denied this for the most part. Thus the Government could properly inquire into whether he had used Chemical money to finance personal business ventures which culminated in an increase in his net worth. *See United States v. Tramunti*, 513 F.2d 1087, 1105 (2d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 423 U.S. 832 (1975); *United States v. Jackskion*, 102 F.2d 683, 684 (2d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 307 U.S. 635 (1939).

None of the other points raised by appellants merits discussion.

Judgments affirmed.

---

<sup>25</sup> Although relevant, evidence may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, or misleading the jury, or by considerations of undue delay, waste of time, or needless presentation of cumulative evidence. Fed. R. Evid. 403.

**Appendix B ,**

**Unreported Opinion and Order of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York Entered April 13, 1977 Denying Motion by Defendants Hockridge and Petri to Set Aside Verdict**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

76 Cr. 843

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*v.*

WILLIAM HOCKRIDGE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

---

MEMORANDUM

BONSAL, *D.J.*

Prior to the sentencing of defendants William Hockridge and Charles Petri this day, the Court denied their motions and stated it would amplify its reasons for doing so in this Memorandum.

Defendants William Hockridge and Charles Petri move pursuant to Rule 33 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure to have the Court set aside a jury verdict of guilty and grant them a new trial. Defendant Petri also moves pursuant to Rule 29 (F. R. Cr. P.) to have the Court set aside the verdict and enter judgment of acquittal.

*Appendix B*

Defendants Hockridge and Petri contend: (1) that statements made by two jurors during an *in camera* interview conducted by the Court on February 16, 1977, the fourth day of jury deliberations, after the jury had returned a partial verdict of guilty on the conspiracy count, indicate that these jurors had not been convinced of the defendants' participation in the conspiracy beyond a reasonable doubt and had surrendered their conscientious convictions in acquiescing in the verdict of their fellow jurors; (2) that if the verdict on the conspiracy count is set aside, the verdict (s) of guilty on the substantive count (s) must also be set aside; (3) that the taking of a partial verdict on the conspiracy count was improper; and (4) that the Government improperly withheld from the defendants information that the Chemical Bank was under investigation.

In charging the jury that they should exchange views and that they should not be afraid to surrender their original views, the Court instructed the jury that they should never surrender their honest convictions for any reason whatsoever. The Court is satisfied that neither of the two jurors surrendered their honest convictions. *See United States v. Grieco*, 261 F.2d 414 (2d Cir. 1958), *cert. denied*, 359 U.S. 907 (1959).

The jurors who were interviewed were instructed to go back to the jury room and discuss their concerns with their fellow jurors. The next day they joined with their fellow jurors in finding the defendants Hockridge, Petri and Easton guilty on Count 2 (misapplication of funds), and the following day they found the defendant Petri guilty on Count 8 (false statement). On each occasion the jurors were individually polled. Moreover, all the jurors joined in verdicts of not guilty on a number of the

*Appendix B*

substantive counts. It is apparent therefore that the concerns of the two jurors interviewed were met by subsequent deliberations with their fellow jurors.

The Court also concludes that the taking of the partial verdict pursuant to Rule 31 (d) (F.R.Cr.P.) with respect to the conspiracy count was proper under the circumstances. The Court had directed the jury to reach a verdict on the conspiracy count before deliberating on the substantive counts. The jury had deliberated for two days before they were asked if they had reached a verdict on any count. Since the purpose of taking a partial verdict is to avoid a costly and time-consuming retrial in the event that one of the jurors becomes incapacitated, it was in the interest of the defendants as well as the Government to ask whether they had reached a verdict on any count.

Nor were the defendants prejudiced by the "Pinkerton" charge. The Court made it clear that they *may* apply Pinkerton if they had found the defendant they were considering guilty under the conspiracy count. The fact that they found defendants Hockridge and Petri not guilty of a number of substantive counts, after finding them guilty on the conspiracy count, is a clear indication that the defendants were not prejudiced by the Pinkerton charge.

Finally, the defendants were not prejudiced by the alleged failure of the Government to disclose that the Chemical Bank was under investigation. This was clearly not relevant to the facts of this case.

For the foregoing reasons, the defendants' motions are denied,

It is so ordered.

Dated: New York, N.Y.

April 12, 1977

DUDLEY B. BONSAI  
U.S.D.J.

**Order Denying Rehearing**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**SECOND CIRCUIT**

At a Stated Term of the United States Court of Appeals, in and for the Second Circuit, held at the United States Court House, in the City of New York, on the fifteenth day of May, one thousand nine hundred and seventy-eight.

Present:

HONORABLE JAMES L. OAKES

HONORABLE ELLSWORTH VAN GRAAFEILAND

*United States Circuit Judges*

HONORABLE JOHN R. BARTELS

*United States District Judge*

77-1243

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

*v.*

WILLIAM HOCKRIDGE,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

A petition for a rehearing having been filed herein by counsel for the appellant William Hockridge.

Upon consideration thereof, it is Ordered that said petition be and it hereby is denied.

A. DANIEL FUSARO,  
Clerk